

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS
2

1	1. DEFENDANTS' RULE 12 MOTIONS HAVE NOT YET BEEN ADJUDICATED ON	
2	THE MERITS	2
3		
4	2. TAITZ HAS SATISFIED HER BURDEN OF ESTABLISHING THAT THE	
5	CONDUCT COMPLAINED OF IS "PROTECTED ACTIVITY"	3
6	a. The Categories of Misconduct Complained of Against Taitz	4
7	b. Each of the Acts Complained of In Numbers 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9 Are in Connection With a Public Issue Because They Relate to Written and Oral Statements Made Before Administrative/Judicial Proceedings Before Executive and Judicial Bodies and/or Are Pre-Litigation Statements.....	6
8	c. Each of the Remaining Acts Complained of Are in Connection With a Public Issue Because They Relate to Political/Fundraising Activity	7
9		
10	3. PLAINTIFFS HAVE PRESENTED NO COMPETENT EVIDENCE	
11	DEMONSTRATING THEIR PROBABILITY OF PREVAILING ON THE CLAIMS	
12	PRESENTED	10
13	a. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their Claim for Disclosure of Private Information	11
14	b. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their Claim for Defamation Per Se	12
15	c. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their Claim for False Light - Invasion of Privacy	13
16	d. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their Claim for Harassment	14
17	e. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their Claim for False Designations and Descriptions of Facts.....	14
18		
19	f. Plaintiffs Cannot Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their Claim for Injunction Because That is Not a "Stand-Alone" Cause of Action in California	15
20		
21	4. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT TAITZ'S RULE 12(B)(6) MOTION.....	15
22		
23	5. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT TAITZ' RULE 12(B)(1) MOTION	15
24		
25	6. CONCLUSION	16
26		
27		
28		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

4	<i>Aisenson v. American Broad. Co.</i> (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 146, 161, 269 Cal.Rptr. 37913
5	<i>Bank One, Texas, N.A. v. Montle</i> (1st Cir. 1992) 964 F.2d 48, 49.....16
6	<i>Bechtel v. Liberty Nat'l Bank</i> (9th Cir. 1976) 534 F.2d 1335, 1341, fn. 8.....2
7	<i>Bergman v. Drum</i> (2005) . 29 Cal.App.4th 11, 18.....10
8	<i>Briggs v. Eden Council for Hope & Opportunity</i> (1999) 19 Cal.4th 1106, 1113, 81
9	Cal.Rptr.2d 4714
10	<i>Chavez v. Mendoza</i> (2001) 94 Cal.App.4th 1083, 1087, 114 Cal.Rptr.2d 8253
11	<i>CKE Restaurants, Inc. v. Moore</i> (2008) 159 Cal.App.4th 262, 271, 70 Cal.Rptr.3d 921,
12	928.....6
13	<i>Cornerstone v. Davies</i> (1952) 38 Cal.2d 315, 322, 239 P.2d 87611
14	<i>Crowley v. Katileman</i> (1994) 8 Cal.4th 666, 681, 34 Cal.Rptr.2d 386.....15
15	<i>D.C. v. R.R.</i> (2010) 182 CalApp.4th 1190, 106 Cal.Rptr.3d 399.....8
16	<i>Damon v. Ocean Hills Journalism Club</i> (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 468, 479, 102 Cal.Rptr.2d
17	205, 212.....7
18	<i>Du Charme v. International Broth. of Elec. Workers, Local 45</i> (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th
19	107, 119, 1 Cal.Rptr.3d 5018
20	<i>Fellows v. National Enqui 'er, Inc.</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 234, 238, 228 Cal.Rptr. 215.....13
21	<i>Fellows v. National Enquirer, Inc.</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 234, 242, 228 Cal.Rptr. 215.....14
22	<i>Forsher v. Bugliosi</i> (1980) 26 Cal.3d 792, 808-809, 163 Cal.Rptr. 628
23	12
24	<i>Hill v. NCAA</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4 th 1, 26, 26 Cal.Rptr.2d 834.....12
25	<i>Kurwa v. Harrington, Foxx, Dubrow & Canter, LLP</i> (2007) 146 Cal.App.4th 841, 846, 53
26	Cal.Rptr.3d 256, 2607
27	<i>Lewis v. Lewis</i> (9th Cir. 1966) 358 F.2d 495, 502
28	16
29	<i>M.G. v. Time Warner, Inc.</i> (2001) 89 Cal.App.4 th 623, 629, 107 Cal.Rptr.2d 504
30	3
31	<i>McGarry v. University of San Diego</i> (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 97, 108
32	10
33	<i>Navellier v. Sletten</i> (2002) 29 Cal.4 th 82, 88-89, 124 Cal.Rptr. 530
34	3
35	<i>Neville v. Chudacoff</i> (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 1255, 1262-1263, 73 CR3d 383, 388-389
36	7

1	<i>Neville v. Chudacoff</i> (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th at 1266, 73 Cal.Rptr.3d at 391, fn. 8	6
2	<i>Saadeh v. Farouki</i> (DC Cir. 1997) 107 F.3d 52, 56–57	16
3	<i>Shell Oil Co. v. Richter</i> (1942) 52 Cal.App.2d 164, 168, 125 P.2d 930	15
4	<i>Shulman v. Group W Productions, Inc.</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4 th 200, 214, 74 Cal.Rptr.2d 843 ...	11
5	<i>Sipple v. Chronicle Publ'g Co.</i> (1984) 154 Cal.App.3d 1040, 1047, 201 Cal.Rptr. 665	12
6	<i>Sipple v. Foundation for Nat'l Progress</i> (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 226, 236–240, 83 Cal.Rptr.2d 677	8
7		
8	<i>Taus v. Loftus</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 683, 714	10
9		
	<u>Statutes</u>	
10	18 U.S.C. 875(d)	14
11	425.16(e)(2)	7
12	47 U.S.C. 223(a)	14
13	California Civil Code §45	12
14	California Code of Civil Procedure §425.16	3, 6
15	California Code of Civil Procedure §425.16(b)(1)	10
16	California Code of Civil Procedure § 425.16(e)(3)	7
17	California Code of Civil Procedure § 425.16(e)(4)	7
18	California Penal Code section 115(a)	13, 15
19	California Penal Code section 472	13, 15